

faith to raise legitimate public health concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 163

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) and the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) were added as cosponsors of S. 163, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove short-barreled rifles, short-barreled shotguns, and certain other weapons from the definition of firearms for purposes of the National Firearms Act, and for other purposes.

S. 173

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 173, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 184

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 184, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022.

S. CON. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 2, a concurrent resolution commending the bravery, courage, and resolve of the women and men of Iran demonstrating in more than 133 cities and risking their safety to speak out against the Iranian regime's human rights abuses.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 203. A bill to amend section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to require an electronic, searchable database of the importation, production, shipment, receipt, sale, or other disposition of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, today I rise to introduce the Crime Gun Tracing Modernization Act.

This bill would bring ATF into the 21st century by allowing the Agency to electronically search for the records of

guns used in crimes across the country. It is hard to believe that ATF still must store paper records and search them by hand in order to identify the guns used for criminal activity. These archaic rules prevent the people responsible for enforcing our laws from doing their jobs effectively.

The National Tracing Center at ATF is responsible for quickly placing crime gun ownership information into the hands of law enforcement officials so they can solve crimes and save lives. In 2021, National Tracing Center receive over 540,000 trace requests.

Unfortunately, the timely completion of these trace requests has been made nearly impossible because ATF cannot search these records electronically.

To make matters worse, these millions of records are stored in thousands of boxes that are overflowing the hallways of the National Tracing Center in Martinsburg, WV. The records that agents must search through are so massive, ATF has been told that if it places more boxes inside the facility, the floor may collapse.

Every moment after a crime is committed matters dearly to our law enforcement agencies. Prohibiting the efficient search of these records puts our communities at risk.

I thank my former colleague Senator Leahy for championing this bill last Congress. I am committed to continuing the fight for this important fix.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 204. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, later today, I will introduce the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, along with my colleague Senator LANKFORD. It is a simple bill. It simply states that a baby born alive after an attempted abortion is entitled to the same protection and medical care that any other newborn baby is entitled to. And you would think that it would be a simple "yes" vote from every Member of this body, but unfortunately, that is not where we are.

Four years ago and then three years ago, the U.S. Senate took up this bill, and almost every single Democrat in this body voted against it. Just 3 weeks ago, the House of Representatives took up this bill, and almost every single Democrat over there voted against it. Apparently banning infanticide is now controversial because—let's be clear—that is what we are talking about here.

Some Democrats have tried to cloak their opposition to this bill in meaningless phrases about a private decision

between a woman and her doctor, but what is the decision we are talking about? We are talking about whether or not a living baby, born after an attempted abortion, should be provided with medical care or be left to die or, I suppose, be killed outright by the abortionist. That is what we are talking about. That is the "decision" Democrats are referring to. And that is apparently the decision they think should be left up to patients and their doctors—whether or not to let a living, breathing baby die.

The Senate voted on a previous version of this bill introduced by my former colleague Senator Sasse 4 years ago when the Democratic Governor of Virginia came right out and said you could keep a newly born baby comfortable while you decided what to do with it—in other words, while you decided whether to let the child die or, I guess, kill it or whether to let it live. That chilling statement made it abundantly clear that we needed to state explicitly that any baby, wherever he or she is born, including in an abortion clinic, is entitled to medical care. It is staggering that we have gotten to the point where we need to debate this in Congress, staggering that this wouldn't be an automatic "yes" vote from every Member of this body, but that is where we are.

If anyone thinks that abortion isn't a slippery slope, that we can somehow devalue unborn babies' lives while maintaining respect for everyone else's, then I am here to tell them differently because the Democratic Party has gotten to the point where its members not only oppose legislation to protect unborn babies; they oppose legislation to protect born ones as well. In Democrats' world, there are now apparently two classes of born babies: the wanted ones born alive in delivery rooms and the unwanted ones born alive in abortion clinics. Apparently, only one of those classes of babies is entitled to the equal protection of the laws.

Democrats talk a lot about abortion when they are talking about this bill, but this bill, of course, would do absolutely nothing to restrict abortion. It is not a bill protecting unborn babies; it is a bill protecting born babies.

I do understand why Democrats are so worked up, though, because while this bill may not do anything to restrict abortion, there is always the chance that drawing attention to the humanity and dignity of the child who has just been born will draw attention to the humanity and dignity of the child who is about to be born—the child Democrats are determined our laws should not protect. And Democrats are apparently so determined to preserve the so-called right to kill unborn babies that they are fully comfortable opposing a law that would protect born—born—babies.

These are hard things to talk about, but they have to be said because that is the reality of where we are right now.